	Budget authority	Outlays	Deficit
Revised Allocation: Budget Resolution	1,438,190,000,000	1,424,145,000,000	−16,063,000,000

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 1, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,652,679,330,611.02 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-two billion, six hundred seventy-nine million, three hundred thirty thousand, six hundred eleven dollars and two cents).

One year ago, October 1, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,540,570,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty billion, five hundred seventy million).

Fifteen years ago, October 1, 1984, the Federal debt stood at $1,572,266,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred seventy-two billion, two hundred sixty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 1, 1974, the Federal debt stood at $481,059,000,000 (Four hundred eighty-one billion, fifty-nine million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,171,620,330,611.02 (Five trillion, one hundred seventy-one billion, six hundred twenty million, three hundred thirty thousand, six hundred eleven dollars and two cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1606. An act to reenact chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–5497. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99–NM–216 (9–28/9–30)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0370), received September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5498. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–270 (9–24/9–30)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0369), received September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5499. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A320 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–48 (9–24/9–30)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0368), received September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5500. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Pratt & Whitney JT9D–7R4 Series Turbofan Engines; Docket No. 99–NE–06 (9–24/9–30)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0366), received September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5501. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Pratt & Whitney PW2000 Series Turbofan Engines; Docket No. 99–NE–02 (9–24/9–30)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0365), received September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MACK, from the Joint Economic Committee:

Special report entitled ''The 1999 Joint Economic Report'' (Rept. No. 106–169).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1236: A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of the construction of the Arrowrock Dam Hydroelectric Project in the State of Idaho (Rept. No. 106–170).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 3: A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1683. A bill to make technical changes to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1684. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the consumptive demand exception relating to the importation of goods made with forced labor and to clarify that forced or indentured labor includes forced or indentured child labor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1685. A bill to authorize the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution disapproving the Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, pursuant to the order of section 602 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 195. Expressing the sense of the Senate concerning Dr. William Ransom Wood; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1683. A bill to make technical changes to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RURAL ALASKA ACCESS RIGHTS ACT OF 1999

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation to make technical amendments to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA).

This legislation is a Rural Alaska Bill of Rights.

This legislation is the direct result of no less than six hearings I have held on this issue since becoming chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

During these hearings I was continuously assured by the administration that many of the frustrations Alaskans face because of the interpretation of ANILCA could be dealt with administratively. Unfortunately, many of the problems remain unresolved today.

Some background on this issue is appropriate.

Nineteen years ago Congress enacted ANILCA placing more than 100 million acres of land out of 365 into a series of vast parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness units.

Much of the concern about the act was the impact these Federal units, and related management restrictions, would have on traditional activities and lifestyles of the Alaskan people.

To allay these concerns, ANILCA included a series of unique provisions designed to ensure that traditional activities and lifestyles would continue, and that Alaskans would not be subjected to a ''Permit Lifestyle,'' as the

senior Senator from Alaska has often said.

It is for these reasons that ANILCA is often called ''compromise legislation'' and indeed it was—part of the compromise was that lands would be placed in CSU's and the other part was that Alaskans would be granted certain rights with regard to access and use in these units.

These rights were not only granted to the individuals that live in Alaska but were designed to allow the State itself to play a major role in the planning and use of these areas.

However, the Federal Government has not lived up to its end of the bargain—many of the Federal managers seem to have lost sight of these important representations to the people of Alaska, specifically on issues such as access across these areas and use in them.

Federal managers no longer recognize the crucial distinction between managing units surrounded by millions of people in the Lower 48 and vast multi-million acre units encompassing just a handful of individuals and communities in Alaska.

The result is the creation of the exact ''permit lifestyle'' which we were promised would never happen.

The delegation and other Members of this body warned this could be the case when the legislation passed.

As one Member of this body noted in the Senate report on this bill:

This Piece of Legislation, if enacted will prove to be the most important legislation ever affecting Alaska . . . While we in Congress may be reading the provisions one way . . . regulatory tools are all laid out in the bill to give rise to future bureaucratic nightmare for the people of Alaska . . . Frankly, I am expecting the worst . . . the use of massive conservation system unit designations to block exploration, development, and recreation of these lands and on adjacent non-federal lands.

How prophetic!

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has held extensive hearings in Alaska on the implementation of ANILCA in Anchorage, Wrangell and Fairbanks.

In these hearings we have heard from nearly 100 witnesses—representing every possible interest group.

Four clear themes have emerged from those hearings:

Federal agencies have failed to honor the promises made to Alaskans when ANILCA was passed into law;

Agencies are not providing prior and existing right holders with reasonable use and access in the exercise of their property right;

Agency personnel manage Alaska wilderness areas and conservation units the same way that similar units are being managed in the Lower 48—contrary to the intent of Congress; and

Agencies, while stating their willingness to address complaints, fail to act in a reasonable and timely fashion when it comes to dealing with specific issues.

Some of the specific issues identified include such absurdities as:

Indivduals and corporations are asked to pay hundreds-of-thousands of dollars to do an EIS for access to their own properties when none is required by law.

Millions of acres of public lands are closed to recreationists without ever having identified a resource threat.

When a tree falls on somebody's cabin or a bear destroys it Federal regulators will not let a person make reasonable repairs.

At field hearings the administration asked for time to address these problems—we gave them time—and little has happened.

We have not ''jumped'' to a legislative solution, rather we have acknowledged that oversight has failed to produce meaningful administrative change.

Does it make sense that:

When land managers are assigned to Alaska they are not required to have any formal ANILCA training?

When a tree falls on somebody's cabin or a bear destroys it that Federal regulators will not let a person make reasonable repairs.

People are told they will have to pay ridiculous sums of money to access their inholdings?

The answer to all these questions is clearly no. These are some of the problems that have to be resolved and are included in this legislation.●

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1684. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the consumptive demand exception relating to the importation of goods made with forced labor and to clarify that forced or indentured labor includes forced or indentured child labor; to the Committee on Finance.

GOODS MADE WITH FORCED OR INDENTURED CHILD LABOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1684

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GOODS MADE WITH FORCED OR INDENTURED LABOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''; but in no case'' and all that follows to the end period; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For purposes of this section, the term 'forced labor or/and indentured labor' includes forced or indentured child labor.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) applies to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CHILD LABOR.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1685. A bill to authorize the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GOLDEN SPIKE/CROSSRODS OF THE WEST NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT OF 1999

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation today which authorizes the creation of the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area in Ogden, Utah.

Utah has a rich railroad heritage that stems from the earliest days when the Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroads met at Promontory Point, Utah in 1869 and completed the transcontinental railroad. With the coming of the railroad, Utah's mining industry boomed and our economy grew and the once isolated Desert Kingdom became forever connected to the rest of the United States. Diverse peoples and cultures would come to or through Utah. Mormon immigrants from Europe, Chinese laborers working for the Central Pacific Railroad and Greek coal miners on their way to the coal fields in Central Utah. All of them would pass through the rail station in Ogden on their way to settle the Intermountain West. It truly is a heritage area for us all.

Fire destroyed the original rail station first built in 1889. In 1924 the current Union Station Depot was then built and remained the hub of transcontinental rail traffic for another 40 years. The current building, which is a registered historic site, has been refurbished and is an outstanding example of reuse and redevelopment of industrial areas. The facilities at Union Station also house some of the finest museum collections in the West including the Browning Firearms Museum and the Utah State Railroad Museum.

It is the intent of this legislation to preserve the historical nature of the area, increase public awareness and appreciation for the pivotal role Ogden played in the settlement of the Intermountain West. By general standards, this will be a very small Heritage Area, encompassing just a few city blocks around the Union Station building. While it may be small, it also has a very colorful history. There were no businesses which were more famous, or infamous than those that dotted 24th and 25th Streets.

The legislation would allow Ogden City to operate as the management entity for the area, working in closely with the National Park Service. The City will be responsible for developing a management plan which will present comprehensive recommendations for the conservation and management of the area while the National Park Service will work closely with the partners to help with interpretation and the protection of this valuable cultural and historical resource. Working with railroad enthusiasts from all over the country we can develop a long-term management plan which will provide better interpretation of the historical and cultural opportunities.

I hope my colleagues will support me in sponsoring this legislation. Congressman HANSEN has introduced similar legislation and I look forward to working with him and my friends on the Energy Committee to hold hearings and eventually move this bill through the Senate.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution disapproving the Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, pursuant to the order of section 602 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

DISAPPROVING THE LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT INITIATIVE OF 1998

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution that will prevent the implementation of an initiative in the District of Columbia that would allow the use of marijuana for medical treatment.

As many of my colleagues know, the voters of the District of Columbia passed a ballot initiative—Initiative 59—last November that would legalize marijuana use for ''medicinal'' purposes.

Supported by the Mayor and many elected officials in the District, Initiative 59 would permit marijuana use as a treatment for serious illness including ''HIV/AIDS, glaucoma, muscle spasms, and cancer.''

Because physicians are not allowed to prescribe marijuana under federal law, Initiative 59 would allow individuals to use marijuana based on a doctor's ''written or oral recommendation.'' The initiative would also allow the designation of up to four ''caregivers'' who would be able to cultivate, distribute and possess marijuana for the purpose of supplying an individual with marijuana for medicinal purposes.

Proponents of the D.C. initiative, and similar initiatives elsewhere in the country, have argued that marijuana is the only way that individuals can cope with the effects of chemotherapy and AIDS treatments.

However, according to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), individuals who are using marijuana for AIDS, cancer or glaucoma may actually be doing damage to themselves:

AIDS: Scientific studies indicate marijuana damages the immune system, causing further peril to already weakened immune systems. HIV-positive marijuana smokers progress to full-blown AIDS twice as fast as non-smokers and have an increased incidence of bacterial pneumonia.

Cancer: Marijuana contains many cancer-causing substances, many of which are present in higher concentrations in marijuana than in tobacco.

Glaucoma: Marijuana does not prevent blindness due to glaucoma.

In addition, Dr. Donald R. Vereen, Jr., Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (commonly referred to as the office of the ''Drug Czar''), in an article titled, ''Is Medical Marijuana an Oxymoron?'' and printed in Physicians Weekly on February 1, 1999, stated:

No medical research has shown smoked marijuana to be safe, effective, or therapeutically superior to other substances. Synthetic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the primary psychoactive ingredient in marijuana, has been available for fifteen years in pill form (Marinol) to treat HIV Wasting Syndrome and chemotherapy-induced nausea. A legal drug, Marinol is the real ''medical marijuana.'' It is available in measured doses and guaranteed purity without the adverse side-effects of smoking tars, hydrocarbons, and other combustibles. Furthermore, newer drugs like ondansetron and grenisetron work better than Marinol, as clinical practice has demonstrated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Dr. Vereen be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

In an attempt to prevent this initiative from going into effect, last October, Congress passed and the President signed into law the fiscal year 1999 D.C. Appropriations bill which included a provision that blocked the District government from releasing the vote results of Initiative 59.

The provision was challenged in court, and last month, the prohibition was overruled by a federal judge and the results were made public.

Meanwhile, as the battle over releasing the ballot figures was being fought, Congress re-emphasized its opposition to Initiative 59 in the fiscal year 2000 D.C. Appropriations bill by prohibiting the use of funds to ''enact or carry out any law, rule or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession use or distribution of any Schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act.''

Mr. President, under federal law, marijuana is a controlled substance, and as such, possession, use, sale or distribution is illegal and is subject to federal criminal sentences and/or fines. Possession of marijuana is a crime in the District as well, with the possibility of 6 months in jail and a $1,000 fine.

Congress merely sought to uphold current law by saying no to the implementation of Initiative 59, and no to the use of marijuana.

Nevertheless, the President vetoed the D.C. Appropriations bill last Tuesday, issuing a statement that stressed that Congress was ''prevent(ing) local residents from making their own decisions about local matters.''

However, there appears to be some confusion over the Administration's direction on such legalization initiatives.

Last Wednesday, before the House D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee, Dr. Donald R. Vereen, Jr. of the Drug Czar's office stated that:

The Administration has actively and consistently opposed marijuana legalization initiatives in all jurisdictions throughout the nation. Our steadfast opposition is based on the fact that: such electoral procedures undermine the medical-scientific process for establishing what is a safe and effective medicine; contradict federal regulations and laws; and in the Office of National Drug Control Policy's view, may be vehicles for the legalization of marijuana for recreational use.''

I refuse to believe that the President wants the American people to think that he is more concerned about not violating Home Rule than he is about upholding federal law, particularly when experts within the administration are opposed to legalization.

In a June 29th article in the Washington Post, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Barry McCaffrey stated that:

The term ''drug legalization'' has rightfully acquired pejorative connotations. Many supporters of this position have adopted the label ''harm reduction'' to soften the impact of an unpopular proposal that, if passed, would encourage greater availability and use of drugs—especially among children.

This past June, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, Donnie Marshall, Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) stated ''I suspect that medical marijuana is merely the first tactical maneuver in an overall strategy that will lead to the eventual legalization of all drugs.'' He went on to say ''whether all drugs are eventually legalized or not, the practical outcome of legalizing even one, like marijuana, is to increase the amount of usage of all drugs.''

Indeed, according to the DEA, 12–17 year olds who smoke marijuana are 85 times more likely to use cocaine than those who do not. Sixty percent of adolescents who use marijuana before age 15 will later use cocaine. If these usage figures are occurring now, I shudder to think what they will be if we expand marijuana's usage.

Assistant Chief Brian Jordan of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department testified last Wednesday before the House D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee that ''the Metropolitan Police Department opposes the legalization of marijuana. Marijuana remains the illegal drug of choice in the Nation's Capital, and crime and violence related to the illegal marijuana trafficking and abuse are widespread in many of our communities.''

According to D.C. government estimates, Washington currently has 65,000 drug addicts. There are 1,000 individuals on a drug treatment waiting list who are likely continuing to abuse drugs right now.

I believe the loose wording of the initiative—which again, would legalize an individual's right to possess, use, distribute or cultivate marijuana if ''recommended'' by a physician—would present an enforcement nightmare to police in the District of Columbia, and would serve as a de facto legalization of marijuana in D.C., increasing its prevalence and the number of addicts citywide.

In the simplest of terms, illegal drug use is wrong. The District government and the United States Government

should never condone it, regardless of the professed purpose.

That is why I am introducing this joint resolution. It's quite simple. It says that the Congress disapproves of the legalization of marijuana for medicinal purposes and prevents Initiative 59 from going into effect. Period.

It is identical to legislation that the House will likely take-up next week.

I agree with DEA Deputy Administrator Donnie Marshall that once society accepts that it's alright for individuals to smoke marijuana for, quote ''medical purposes'' unquote, we will start on the path towards greater social acceptance and usage of marijuana, which experts agree will lead to the use of harder drugs.

Mr. President, marijuana is an illegal drug according to federal, state and local laws. It would be unconscionable for the United States Congress not to exercise its Constitutional duty and prevent the District from going forward with this initiative no matter how well-intentioned the motive.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution, and I urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the joint resolution in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998, approved by the electors of the District of Columbia on November 3, 1998, and transmitted to Congress by the Council pursuant to section 602(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

EXHIBIT 1

[Physicians Weekly, Feb. 1, 1999]

IS MEDICAL MARIJUANA AN OXYMORON?

(By Dr. Donald Vereen Deputy Director, White House Office of National Drug Control Policy)

No medical research has shown smoked marijuana to be safe, effective, or therapeutically superior to other substances. Synthetic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the primary psychoactive ingredient in marijuana, has been available for fifteen years in pill form (Marinol) to treat HIV Wasting Syndrome and chemotherapy-induced nausea. A legal drug, Marinol is the real ''medical marijuana.'' It is available in measured doses and guaranteed purity without the adverse side-effects of smoking tars, hydrocarbons, and other combustibles. Furthermore, newer drugs like ondansetron and grenisetron work better than Marinol, as clinical practice has demonstrated.

Objections about pills being difficult to swallow by nauseated patients are true for any antiemetic. If sufficient demand existed for an alternate delivery system, Marinol inhalants, suppositories, injections, or patches could be developed. Why isn't anyone clambering to make anti-nausea medications smokable? Why choose a substance and delivery system (smoking) that is more carcinogenic than tobacco when safer forms of the same drug are available? Patients deserve answers to these germane questions instead of being blind-sided by the ''medical marijuana'' drive.

The American Medical Association (AMA), American Cancer Society, National Multiple Sclerosis Association, American Academy of Ophthalmology, and National Eye Institute, among others, came out against ''medical marijuana'' initiatives as did former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop. Anecdotal support for smoked marijuana reminds me of the laetrile incident where a drug derived from apricot pits was believed to cure cancer. Scientific testing disproved such testaments. How do we know that testimonials touting marijuana as a wonder drug—on the part of patients under the influence of an intoxicant, no less!—may not simply demonstrate the placebo effect?

We shouldn't allow drugs to become publicly available without approval and regulation by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and National Institutes of Health (NIH). Such consumer protections has made our country one of the safest for medications. A political attempt to exploit human suffering to legalize an illicit drug is shameful and irresponsible. Voters should not be expected to decide which medicines are safe and effective. What other cancer treatments have been brought to the ballot box? Marijuana initiatives set a dangerous precedent. Decisions of this sort should be based on scientific proof, not popularity.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 51

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 63

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 63, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for employers who provide child care assistance for dependents of their employees, and for other purposes.

S. 74

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to encourage the timely development of a more cost effective United States commercial space transportation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to provide for full parity with respect to health insurance coverage for certain severe biologically-based mental illnesses and to prohibit limits on the number of mental illness-related hospital days and outpatient visits that are covered for all mental illnesses.

S. 1044

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1044, a bill to require coverage for colorectal cancer screenings.

S. 1139

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1139, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to civil penalties for unruly passengers of air carriers and to provide for the protection of employees providing air safety information, and for other purposes.

S. 1375

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1375, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who commit acts of torture abroad are inadmissible and removable and to establish within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice an Office of Special Investigations having responsibilities under that Act with respect to all alien participants in acts of genocide and torture abroad.

S. 1472

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to modify employee contributions to the Civil Service Retirement System and the Federal Employees Retirement System to the percentages in effect before the statutory temporary increase in calendar year 1999, and for other purposes.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to taxpayers investing in entities seeking to provide capital to create new markets in low-income communities.

S. 1673

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1673, a bill to amend titles 10 and 18, United States Code, to protect unborn victims of violence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 179, a resolution designating October 15, 1999, as ''National Mammography Day.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 183

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from California